

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10 are currently being prosecuted. Claim 7 remains withdrawn from consideration. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Entry of Amendment

It is respectfully requested that the present Amendment should be entered into the official file in view of the fact that the Amendment automatically places the application in condition for allowance. Alternatively, if the Examiner does not agree that the application is in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the present Amendment should be entered for the purpose of appeal.

The amendment to claim 1 further limits the claimed invention and in the process reduces the issues on appeal. Also, applicants are submitting arguments as to several elements not seen in the cited references. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment is considered proper.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Stone (USP 5,314,114) in view of Stone (USP 3,963,173) and Giblin et al. (US 5,320,279). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the primary reference Stone '114 shows a container having a hexahedral configuration with a container main body 26, a lid member 28 attached to a back side edge part 29 and having an upper surface lid part 12, a front surface lid part 57, a pair of side lid parts, an inner carton part with a concave cut out part formed on the front board and severance guideline 24 extending obliquely downward along a pair of side boards and along the front board. The Examiner admits that this reference does not show that the severance guideline extends from opposite ends of the connecting ridgeline and that the concave cut out part is completely removed.

The Examiner states that Stone '173 shows a container with a inner carton part having a concave cut out part completely removed and severance guideline extending from opposite ends of the connecting ridgeline. The Examiner feels that it would have been obvious to provide the container of Stone '114 with a lid and cut

out structure as shown by Stone '173. The Examiner admits that this combination still does not show an inner carton part mounted on either side of the container and separate therefrom.

The Examiner cites the Giblin et al. reference to show an inner carton part separate from the container and feels that it would have been obvious to modify the container in Stone '114 with an inner carton part.

Applicant submits that the references do not show the invention as presently claimed even if combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner states that Stone '173 shows a concave cut out part completely removed from the front board. However, the claim also requires that the cut out part be large enough to allow removal of contents from the front side. As is clearly seen in Figure 19 of Stone '173, the cutout part is very shallow and would not allow removal of any contents from the front of the box.

The Examiner admits that Stone '114 does not show that the severance extends to the ends of the connecting ridgeline. The Examiner relies on Stone '173 to show that the severance guidelines can extend from the connecting ridgelines. However, Stone '173 does not show a severance guideline, but merely perforations.

Stone '114 shows an actual tear strip extending horizontally around part of three sides of the container. However, Stone '173 only shows perforations. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the combination of these two references still do not show a severance guideline which extends from opposite ends of the connecting ridgeline. Further, Stone '114 clearly has a tear strip which is linear so that it is easily formed from the cardboard blank. It is not seen how the perforations in Stone '173 would be used in the box of Stone '114 to have the tear strip extend to the end of the ridgelines.

Claim 1 also describes in more detail the arrangement of severance guidelines which is not seen in the combination of the references for the same reasons. The claim also describes that the cutout part and the lid allow the contents to be removed when the lid is only back as far as the backboard. The particular feature is not described in any of the references.

Applicants have also now added a limitation to claim 1 to further help describe the size of the exposed portion of the front board of the inner carton. The claim now describes the upper half of the front board as extending above the severance guidelines. This limitation is based on the description found on page 8, lines

25-27 which describes that the upper half part of the front board is exposed upward of the outer jacket 20. This feature further helps to describe the size of the cutout portion and the extent of the lid 18. This is different from any of the three boxes cited in the references which have a much smaller opening and a much more limited ability to reach into the box to remove articles. In particular, Stone '173 shows a cutout portion which is a very small part of the front board. Applicant submits that the particular feature is not seen in the combination of the references and would not be obvious thereof. Respectfully, Applicant submit that claim 1 further defines thereover.

Claims 3-6, 8-10 depend from claim 1 and as such are also considered to be allowable.

Regarding claim 4, the Examiner admits that the three way combination does not teach the limitation of the layers of the material. The Examiner relies on the Wood et al. (US 5,985,772) reference to show such a layering. Applicant submits that the addition of a fourth reference would not be obvious and further that claim 4 is allowable based on its dependency from claim 1. Applicants submit that all the claims are accordingly allowable.

Claim 10 has now been added to specify the multi-layered arrangement when a sheet-like detergent or tablet-like detergent is contained in the paper container. This arrangement allows the detergent to be taken out by hand easily through the concave cutout part in the front of the container. This differs from the prior art where the height of the concave cutout part is only about one-sixth of the height of the container. Accordingly, the prior art device makes it more difficult to take out goods arranged in a multi-layered manner. Accordingly, with this type of detergent, the larger cutout part makes it easier to remove detergents when they are multi-layered, especially due to the structure that the ridge line in the top surface is made in a hingedly connecting part.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied upon by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully

requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse (Reg. No. 27,295) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

John W. Bailey, #32,881

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

 JWB/RFG/mls/gf